

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful review of the application as set forth in the outstanding office action. Reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claim 45 has been amended to add the recitation "a plurality of ink feed openings formed through the thin film layer to provide respective ink paths through the thin film layer from the ink feed slot" to provide proper antecedent basis for the subsequent recitation of "wherein said plurality of ink feed openings..."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claim 40-41 stand rejected as being indefinite, on the ground that there is insufficient antecedent basis for limitations in these claims. The foregoing amendments to Claim 40 address this rejection.

Claims Rejections - 35 USC 102

Claims 40-45 stand rejected as being anticipated by Steinfield et al. ("Steinfield"). Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection on the ground that a prima facie case of anticipation has not been established, and note that the foregoing amendments to Claim 40 clearly moot the rejection.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assumptions regarding the teachings of Steinfield. For example, while the Examiner assumes that Steinfield describes ink paths through the substrate, Steinfield states at 9:18-22:

"Fig. 13 also illustrates how ink 88 from the ink reservoir 12 flows through the central slot 52 formed in the print cartridge 10 and flows around the edges 86 of the substrate 28 through ink channels 80 into the vaporization chambers 92 and 94."

Claim 45 is amended to recite the limitation of "an ink feed slot formed through the substrate." Steinfield at FIG. 13 does not describe a printhead as recited in Claim 45, including, e.g., this newly added feature.

Claims 40-44 depend from Claim 45, and add further distinguishing limitations.

The rejection under Section 102 should be withdrawn.

New Claims 46-80

Claim 46 is generally drawn to subject matter of canceled Claim 6, and dependent Claims 47-55 add limitations generally similar to those of canceled Claims 2-5 and 8-11, respectively.

Claim 56 is drawn generally to subject matter of canceled Claim 12, and also recites "one or more fluid feed slots formed through the substrate to provide fluid to the drop generators in the columnar group." Dependent Claims 57-64 are drawn generally, although not identically, to limitations in canceled Claims 13-14 and 17-21, respectively.

Claim 65 is drawn generally to subject matter of canceled 22, with the limitation "feeding the subgroups with fluid through a slot formed through the substrate." Dependent Claims 66-72 are drawn generally, although not identically, to subject matter of canceled Claims 23-29, respectively.

Claim 73 is drawn generally to subject matter of canceled Claims 30 and 31. Claims 74-77 are drawn generally to subject matter of canceled Claims 32-35.

Claim 78 is drawn generally to subject matter of canceled Claims 36 and 37. Claims 79-80 are drawn generally to subject matter of canceled Claims 38-39.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 46-80 are allowable over the combination of Steinfield and Maeda. Neither reference discloses or suggests structures or methods which include, but are not limited to, the following exemplary limitations:

a substrate having a surface, and a fluid supply slot formed through the substrate to the surface (Claim 46)

one or more fluid feed slots formed through the substrate to provide fluid to the drop generators in the columnar group (Claim 56)

feeding the subgroups with fluid through a slot formed through the substrate (Claim 65)

wherein the ink flow path for each nozzle subgroup includes an opening or set of openings through the substrate, and wherein each nozzle of a nozzle subgroup is supplied with ink via said opening or set of openings (Claim 73)

a substrate having an ink feed slot formed therein (Claim 78)

Steinfeld has been discussed above. Maeda does not disclose a substrate having a feed opening or slot formed through the substrate. The nozzles are fed with ink along a top surface of a substrate; the feed path is not described as through a substrate opening or slot.

Claims 46-80 should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

The outstanding rejections have been addressed, and the application is in condition for allowance. Such favorable reconsideration is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Larry K. Roberts".

Larry K. Roberts
Registration No. 28,464

Dated: 11/6/03

Law Offices of Larry K. Roberts, Inc.
P.O. Box 8569
Newport Beach, CA 92658-8569
Telephone (949) 640-6200
Facsimile (949) 640-1206